

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Status

The Office Action indicates that claims 1-7 and 9-24 are pending in this application and have been rejected. Claims 1, 9, 13, 17 and 21 are herein amended, and new claims 25-31 are herein presented. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-7 and 9-31 are pending. Of these claims, claims 1, 9, 17, and 28-31 are independent in form. No new matter has been added by the amendments presented herein.

The 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection

The Office Action maintains the rejection of claims 1-7 and 9-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by USP 6,256,515 to Cox et al. ("Cox"). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that Applicants' claimed invention is patentably distinct over Cox, individually or in combination with the prior art of record.

Cox relates to a call management system to manage the use of specified wireless phones ("controlled phones:"), such as wireless phones provided by an organization to its employees, so that unofficial calls (e.g., non-business related calls) to and from the controlled phones can be restricted or managed. Calls originated from or directed to a controlled wireless telephone (which are identified by their MIN, ANI, or ESN) are routed to a call management center from a wireless central office (e.g., a Mobile Switching Center, "MSC"). The call management center determines whether the call is approved by consulting a database of approved telephone numbers associated with the controlled phone. If the telephone number of the party called by the controlled phone, or alternatively, if the telephone number of the party

calling the controlled phone, is listed as a pre-approved number in the controlled phone's database record, then the call is approved and will be completed. If the telephone number is not listed in the controlled phone's database record, then the call is not approved and will only be completed if the controlled phone user provides a valid access code upon being prompted by the call management system as to the unapproved status of the call. See, e.g., Cox Abstract; col. 10, l. 29—col. 11, line 58; col.13, ll. 15-42.

As may be appreciated, therefore, Cox' call management system manages or restricts calls based solely on the identity of the controlled phone: a mobile switching center identifies a call as being directed to or originating from a controlled phone, and the call management system determines how the call will be handled according to the controlled phone's database record.

With respect to claim 1, Applicants have amended this claim to further clarify that a system for restricting features in a wireless network includes, *inter alia*, at least one database comprising representations of rules for restriction on features of at least one terminal wirelessly connected to the at least one base station, wherein "the restriction for at least one of the at least one terminal is dependent on the specific one of the at least one base station." As noted above, in Cox, any restriction on a call directed to or originated from a controlled wireless telephone is dependent only on the identity of the controlled phone (e.g., as identified by the MIN, ANI, or ESN), as the call management database records associate controlled phones with their corresponding pre-approved list of telephone numbers. These records - and restrictions - are thus necessarily base station independent, the restrictions on the controlled phones applying across the entire wireless network, regardless of the base station. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Cox cannot be said to teach or suggest base station dependent restriction of a

terminal as claimed by Applicants (claim 1) because in Cox all restrictions are necessarily dependent solely on the identity of the controlled phone.

Regarding claims 9 and 17, Applicants have amended these claims to further clarify that “the restriction on the base station [is] independent of the specific identity of the one of a plurality of terminals”. That is, in accordance with a feature of the present invention, restrictions may include restrictions that are invoked by a base station with respect to incoming and/or outgoing calls handled by the base station, and those restrictions are invoked regardless of the specific identity of the wireless terminal to which the incoming call is directed or from which the outgoing call is originated. See, e.g., Applicants’ specification at p. 5, Table 2 and lines 8-24). In contradistinction, as explained above, all restrictions in Cox are necessarily dependent on the identity of the controlled wireless phone. Thus, Cox simply does not teach or suggest restrictions on base stations as claimed by Applicants.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentably distinct over Cox, and thus the §102(b) rejection should be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims

Applicants believe that the claims dependent on independent Claims 1, 9, or 17 are allowable for at least similar reasons set forth above for the independent claims from which they depend. As such, Applicants have not individually addressed the rejection of these dependent claims. Applicants maintain, however, that these dependent claims recite limitations that provide additional and independent bases for patentable distinction over the prior art of record, and Applicants reserve the right to address such rejections and present such grounds for patentability should such be appropriate and/or necessary.

New Claims 25-31

New claims 25-31 are presented to further claim features of Applicants' invention. Applicants note that claim 25 is directed to the subject matter of canceled dependent claim 8.

Additionally, claims 29-31 each recite a similar limitation, namely, that allowance or restriction "depends at least on whether the communication is designated as an emergency". Applicants note that dependent claims 4, 5, 12 and 20 each include limitations directed to emergency communications, and the Office Action alleges that these dependent claims are anticipated by Cox. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that Cox does not disclose or suggest conditioning call restriction/allowance on whether the call is an emergency. In fact, Cox does not even mention an emergency communications.

More specifically, although the Office Action does not specifically identify what Cox discloses that could be considered an emergency communication, Applicants note that the portions of the Cox cited in the Office Action with respect to claims 4, 5, 12, and 20 mention using access codes and also mention police officer calls. Insofar as the Office Action is asserting that either of these teachings of Cox represent emergency communications, Applicants submit that such access codes and police officer calls as disclosed in Cox, in fact, have nothing to do with emergency communications: access codes are entered by controlled phone users to permit unauthorized calls to be connected, and police officer calls concern the ordinary business of the police officers who would be issued a controlled phone by the police department organization.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7 and 9-31 as presented herein are allowable over the prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, and

that the application is hereby placed in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Applicants believe no fees or extensions of time are required for this Amendment. Applicants believe that the petitioned extension of time is sufficient to render this filing timely. However, should an additional extension of time be necessary, such is hereby petitioned, and the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for this paper, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,



Francis G. Montgomery

Reg. No. 41,202

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830
(732) 321-3130